

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/890,815	02/06/2002	David Lockwood	53887-017	7720
20277 7.	590 07/16/2003			
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY 600 13TH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096			EXAMINER	
			DASS, HARISH T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3628	
			DATE MAILED: 07/16/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/890,815	LOCKWOOD, DAVID				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Harish T Dass	3628				
The MAILING DATE f this communication app Period for Reply	pears n the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	36(a). In no event, however, may a y within the statutory minimum of th vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MC , cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely. INTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 h	May 2003					
	is action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	wn from consideration.					
) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
<ul><li>8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or</li><li>Application Papers</li></ul>	r election requirement.					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accept		the Examiner				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on		• •				
If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep	oly to this Office action.					
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received in	Application No				
<ul> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bu</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list</li> </ul>	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))					
14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti	c priority under 35 U.S.C	. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).				
<ul> <li>a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language pro</li> <li>15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesting</li> </ul>	7 7					
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice o	v Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) f Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
S. Patent and Trademark Office						

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claim 7 is added and claims 1-7 are pending.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter, particularly, an abstract idea.

The Examiner notes that the disclosed invention is within the technological arts. The claimed invention is also noted not to be a computer program, data structure, a natural phenomenon, a non-descriptive material per se. The claimed invention does not include a series of steps to be performed by a computer. The claimed invention also is not a product for performing a process, nor is it a specific machine or manufacture. The claimed invention is not a specific tangible machine or process for facilitating a business transaction. Claims 1 and 7 do not appear to correspond to a specific machine or manufacture disclosed within the instant specification and thus encompass any product of the class configured in any manner to perform the underlying process. Claims 1 and 7 do not appear to correspond to a specific machine or manufacture, and thus encompass any product of the class configured in any manner to perform the underlying process. The claimed invention of claims 1 and 7 also do not include a post-computer process activity or a pre-computer process activity. Thus, no physical transformation is performed, no practical application in the technological art is found. Consequently,

claims 1 and 7 are analyzed based upon the underlying process, and are thus rejected as being directed to a non-statutory process.

See State Street Bank & Trust Co. V. Signature Financial Group Inc., 47 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 1998) where the Federal Circuit held that:

"[T]he transformation of data, representing discrete dollar amounts, by a machine through a series of mathematical calculations into a final share price, constitutes a practical application of a mathematical algorithm, formula, or calculation, because it provides "a useful, concrete and tangible result".

# **Double Patenting**

- 2. Claim 7 objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim
- 1. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 09/890,815

Art Unit: 3628

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eng et al (hereinafter Eng - US 6,188,993) in view of Zandi (US 5,966,699).

Re. Claims 1 and 3, Eng discloses a Inside Money (IM) is a synthetic currency transaction network that includes multiple mutual funds, a means for connecting potential borrowers to potential lenders of IM shares, and methods and techniques for conducting private IM share transactions, [entire document particularly, Abs; C2 L8-L35], receiving a plurality of first indications of offers (participants who wish to loan) to lend a security from respective lenders, each of the offers to lend a security indicating a corresponding quantity of the security and a corresponding fee [C7 L5-L11; C2 L24-L35; C2 L66 to C3 L6; C3 L27-L31; C5 L12-L15], and receiving a plurality of second indications of offers to borrow the security from respective borrowers, each of the offers (participants who wish to borrow) to borrow the security indicating a corresponding quantity of the security and a corresponding fee [C7 L5-L11; C2 L24-L35; C2 L66 to C3 L6; C3 L27-L31], and matching one of the offers from one of the lenders with one of the offers from one of the borrowers based on the corresponding quantity and the fee [C3] L7-L32]. Eng, explicitly, does not disclose sending a notification of a transaction between the one lenders and the one borrower based on the matched offer. However, Zandi discloses sending a notification of a transaction between the one lenders and the one borrower based on the matched offer [Zandi - C7 L27-L30; C45-L60]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention

Art Unit: 3628

was made to combine disclosures of Eng and Zandi to send notifications to both parties (lender and borrower) of the acceptance or denial of the of the deal.

Re. Claim 2, Eng discloses further comprising recording the transaction in a database electronically accessible to a plurality of borrowers and lenders over at least one computer network and least one computer [C4 L52-L64].

Re. Claim 4, Eng discloses real time transaction [C3 L33-L45] Eng, explicitly, does not discloses computer system is strictly connected to separate listing financial incentives for real-time confirmation of acceptable financial transactions of the borrowing and lending of securities. However, Zandi discloses wherein said computer system is strictly connected to separate listing financial incentives for real-time confirmation of acceptable financial transactions of the borrowing and lending of securities (loans) [C1 L52-L61; C2 L49-L61; C3 L56 to C4 L26]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to combine disclosures of Eng and Zandi to allow lender to submit bids and borrower to download bids from the server.

Re. Claim 5, Eng discloses Eng IM network and bulletin board system (internet accesses), server [C2 L24-L33; C4 L1-L6; C7 L5-L12]. Eng, explicitly, does not discloses at least one Web computer server for serving as host for computer browsers and providing said browsers with the capability to participate in various auctions of a single product at a specified time the specified number of the product available for sale,

step information and instruction.

Art Unit: 3628

and a Web server cooperating the set the database computer separate from some of servers, said computer based computer being in communication with at least one said Web computer server to allow retrieval product information which includes: a) securities description, b) a quantity of the security to be auctioned c) a duration of the auction, and d) a minimum amount and rate. However, Zandi discloses at least one Web computer server for serving as host for computer browsers and providing said browsers with the capability to participate in various auctions of a single product at a specified time the specified number of the product available for sale, and a Web server cooperating the set the database computer separate from some of servers, said computer based computer being in communication with at least one said Web computer server to allow retrieval product information which includes [C3 L19-L34], a). Securities description [C6 L1-L67], b), a quantity of the security to be auctioned [C8 L1-L5], c), a duration of the auction [C2 L28-L31], and d). a minimum amount and rate [C8 L2-L3; C10 L33-L45; C5 L41-L43]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to combine disclosures of Eng and Zandi to provide a Web site as a communication link to external users (participants) that provides step-by-

Page 6

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eng and Zandi as applied to claim 3 above, in view of Huberman (US 6,078,906).

Art Unit: 3628

Re. Claim 6, neither Eng nor Zandi, explicitly, disclose configured for implementing one or more auction mechanisms, including an English auction, a Dutch auction, a first price sealed bid uniform second price double auction, a simultaneous bidding hazard system, a handshake whisper time interval auction, a silent auction, a callable bid rotation auction, and a Swiss auction. However, Huberman discloses configured for implementing one or more auction mechanisms, including an English auction, a Dutch auction, a first price sealed bid uniform second price double auction, a simultaneous bidding hazard system, a handshake whisper time interval auction, a silent auction, a callable bid rotation auction, and a Swiss auction [C10 L31-L67]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to modify disclosure of Eng and Zandi and include English auction, a Dutch auction, and other types, as taught by Huberman to provide different types of options for auctioning.

### Response to Arguments

- 4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harish T Dass whose telephone number is 703-305-4694. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM to 4:50 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hyung S Sough can be reached on 703-308-0505. The fax phone numbers

Art Unit: 3628

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7687 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

Harish T Dass  $\mathcal{HTD}$ Examiner Art Unit 3628

7/10/03 July 10, 2003

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600